

REMARKS

Applicants respectfully traverse and request reconsideration.

Applicants' attorney wishes to thank the Examiner for the courtesies extended during the telephone conference on March 9, 2007.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(b) as being anticipated by Unger (WO 02/097468). It is alleged that Unger teaches, among other things, switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas. As best understood, however, the three cited portions of Unger, in addition to the corresponding figures, do not teach or describe switching between a plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites. In contrast, Unger appears to only teach switching between antennas based on the signal strength. The first cited portion, page 3, lines 12-24, as best understood, generally describes that having two antennas at different angles is known and that choosing an antenna based on signal strength, not the number of detected satellites (as alleged), is known. The second cited portion, page 6, lines 1-13, as best understood, generally describes that a program executed on a processor can query the antennas over time to determine the signal strength, not the number of detected satellites, as alleged. The third and final cited portion of Unger, page 7, lines 7-15, as best understood, discloses that two modems may be attached to a circuit board and linked to a processor. The modems may then transmit a calculated position to a receiver station such that the receiver station can follow the path of the user. Again, however, this cited portion, as best understood, does not teach or suggest anything related to switching based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas.

Claims 1 and 6, for example, each include a control circuit, operatively coupled to the antenna beam selection structure, and operative to control switching between each of the

plurality of antennas based on the number of positioning satellites detected. Because Unger does not teach or describe switching based on the number of positioning satellites detected, these claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 12 and 16, Unger does not teach, among other things, “acquiring device positioning signals from the positioning satellites using the antenna that is determined to receive device positioning signals from a higher number of positioning satellites.” (Emphasis added.) As such, these claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 20, as amended, Unger does not teach, among other things, a control circuit “operative to control switching between each of the plurality of built in antennas based on at least a number of positioning satellites detected by the satellite network positioning signal processing circuit.” (Emphasis added.) As such, claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-20 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by Forrester (WO 03/071713). It is alleged that Forrester teaches, among other things, switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antennas. Forrester does not, however, teach this, but instead, as best understood, appears to teach what Applicants disclose in the Background – a switching control unit that designates the antenna with the highest reception levels, not the antenna that can detect more satellites, i.e., the choice is not based on a number of positioning satellites detected. (*See, e.g.*, par. 0005.) In the cited paragraphs on page 9, for example, Forrester says, “The matching circuitry 190, for example, may provide the GPS module 165 with maximum GPS signal strength from the first antenna 110 or the second antenna 120.” (Emphasis added.) Furthermore, and continuing onto page 10, the GPS module 165 or main controller 160 “may evaluate GPS

reception characteristics (e.g., signal strength, clarity, bit error rate, etc.) on the first antenna 110 and the second antenna 120.” The evaluation of signal strength can be used “in switching the GPS module 165 to the antenna that can provide the GPS module 165 with the best GPS reception characteristics.” There is no mention, for example, of controlling switching based on the number of positioning satellites detected. As such, and as described in Applicants’ Background, a device such as that described in Forrester, among other things, may not maximize the GPS position resolution capabilities of the device since the antenna with the strongest signals is chosen regardless of whether an antenna can be used to detect more satellites than the other antenna.

Claims 1 and 6, for example, each include a control circuit, operatively coupled to the antenna beam selection structure, and operative to control switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on the number of positioning satellites detected. Because Forrester does not teach or describe switching based on the number of positioning satellites detected, these claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 12 and 16, Forrester does not teach, among other things, “acquiring device positioning signals from the positioning satellites using the antenna that is determined to receive device positioning signals from a higher number of positioning satellites.” (Emphasis added.) As such, these claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

As to claim 20, as amended, Forrester does not teach, among other things, a control circuit “operative to control switching between each of the plurality of built in antennas based on at least a number of positioning satellites detected by the satellite network positioning signal processing circuit.” (Emphasis added.) As such, claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

Claims 1-20 also stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(c) as being anticipated by Mori (EP 1445826). It is alleged that Mori teaches, among other things, “a control circuit operatively coupled to the beam selection structure, and operative to control switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected through each of the antenna.” As best understood, however, Mori teaches that “control unit 302 judges whether or not the measured sensitivity is equal to or larger than a specified value.” (Mori, par. 0066.) If the sensitivity is not equal to or greater than the specified value, the control unit “instructs changeover switch 301 to receive by [the other antenna].” (Mori, par. 0067.) In contrast, the claimed subject matter, such as claim 1, contains a control circuit that “control[s] switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on a number of positioning satellites detected,” not based on the “sensitivity of the received signal.”

Claims 1 and 6, for example, each include a control circuit, operatively coupled to the antenna beam selection structure, and operative to control switching between each of the plurality of antennas based on the number of positioning satellites detected. Because Mori does not teach or describe switching based on the number of positioning satellites detected, these claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.

As to claims 12 and 16, Mori does not teach, among other things, “acquiring device positioning signals from the positioning satellites using the antenna that is determined to receive device positioning signals from a higher number of positioning satellites.” (Emphasis added.) As such, these claims are in condition for allowance. The dependent claims add novel and nonobvious subject matter and are therefore also in condition for allowance.


As to claim 20, as amended, Mori does not teach, among other things, a control circuit “operative to control switching between each of the plurality of built in antennas based on at

least a number of positioning satellites detected by the satellite network positioning signal processing circuit.” (Emphasis added.) As such, claim 20 is in condition for allowance.

Applicants respectfully submit that the claims are in condition for allowance and respectfully request that a timely Notice of Allowance be issued in this case. The Examiner is invited to contact the below listed attorney if the Examiner believes that a telephone conference will advance the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,

Dated: 3-14-07

By: 
Christopher J. Reckamp
Reg. No. 34,414

Vedder, Price, Kaufman & Kammholz, P.C.
222 North LaSalle Street
Chicago, Illinois 60601
PHONE: (312) 609-7599
FAX: (312) 609-5005